



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1917

I.—*Petrarch's Indebtedness to the Libellus of Catullus*

BY PROFESSOR DUANE REED STUART
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN estimating the extent of Petrarch's familiarity with classical authors a frequent source of error has been the offhand and trustful way in which a face value has been given to surface references and quotations as indices of his reading. Earlier critics especially were prone to assume that citation of a given author or allusion to the content of his work necessarily proved direct acquaintance with him on Petrarch's part; they failed now and again to reckon with the possibility that Petrarch's knowledge was drawn from secondary sources, excerpts made from previous writers by their successors, anthologies, and the like. For example, Hertzberg, in his edition of Propertius (Halle, 1843), I, 231, building upon the citation in the second letter to Cicero (Frac. III, 266) of the famous lines of Propertius on the nascent *Aeneid*, concluded that herein lay proof positive that Petrarch knew directly the poems of the Roman elegist. Subsequent research has, to be sure, established the fact that Petrarch had read the elegies. Nevertheless, Hertzberg's evidence by itself was quite inconclusive, as Moritz Haupt, *Opusc.* I, 277, afterwards pointed out. The couplet hailing the new *Aeneid* is found also in the *Life of Vergil* ascribed to Donatus, of which Hertzberg, of course, should have taken cognizance as a possible alternative source.

I have shown elsewhere¹ that the superficial treatment of this point did not cease with Haupt. Since Haupt's time critics in general have seen in Petrarch's citation of the couplet an indication that he was acquainted with the *Life* by Donatus and, in their turn, have overlooked the fact that the lines are found elsewhere than in the *Vita*, namely, in the *Florilegia*. As another instance of the loose methods that have occasionally vitiated the results of former periods of scholarship in this field, may be mentioned in passing the mistaken view of Koerting, *Petrarca's Leben und Werke* (Leipzig, 1878), 487, that Petrarch had read the *de Rerum Natura* of Lucretius. Petrarch's citations of Lucretius were derived from Macrobius; see Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, I, 159-160.

Other pitfalls for the unwary are encountered in the search for such vestiges of Petrarch's wanderings in the fields of antiquity as abide in imitation and reminiscence of authors whom he left unspecified. Listening for literary echoes is a pastime the lure of which students of both ancient and modern literature acknowledge. The practice is, as it has been for ages of scholarship, an eminently respectable method of literary research. With it there can be no quarrel provided that the listener does not unduly strain his ears, is not given to hearing only that which he wishes, and is endowed with the sensitiveness requisite to distinguishing the echo of a single voice from a replica of several blended utterances. He must be alive to the differences among imitation of the word, imitation of literary form, and imitation of the spirit and manner.

It cannot be said that all of those who have expressed themselves on the subject of Petrarch's reactions to classic literature have rigidly set for themselves these requirements. It is true in some measure of the Latin works of Petrarch, and more conspicuously of the Italian poems, that the task of disentangling the separate threads which have been woven, often with great subtlety, into a new fabric, is not so simple

¹ "The Sources and the Extent of Petrarch's Knowledge of the Life of Vergil," *Class. Phil.* XII (1917), 365-404.

as some at first sight have supposed. In dealing with the *Rime* the great danger lies, not in discerning the results of the poet's saturation with the imagery and the locutions of Latin poetry where these results do not reveal themselves, but rather in localizing in a too strict and wooden fashion the sources of his inspiration. If I may essay to express my point in symbols, let *x*, *y*, and *z* represent classical authors with whose works Petrarch was directly acquainted. The fact that in the *Rime* Petrarch indulges in a turn of language or thought that can be paralleled in *x*, cannot constitute an unquestionable proof that he had *x* only in mind, if *y* or *z* offers contexts comparable to that in *x*.

These remarks are commonplaces of criticism. Nevertheless, a stricter deference to these axioms on the part of some scholars who have busied themselves with Petrarch's relation to ancient sources and his manipulation of them, would have obviated divers lapses and untenable conclusions. As matters stand, there are still occasional topics pertaining to the humanist's knowledge of Latin authors about which the last word is yet to be spoken. So, in connection with Petrarch's indebtedness to Catullus and the citation by the lover of Laura of the work of the lover of Lesbia, there are some inaccuracies that should not be perpetuated and a little problem that may be solved.

In 1905 that well-known Latinist, the late Robinson Ellis, published a short essay, entitled *Catullus in the XIVth Century* (London). In this booklet the author, partly on the basis of the first edition of Nolhac's *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, partly as the fruit of his own studies, presented evidence tending to establish Petrarch's acquaintance with a complete manuscript of Catullus. Ellis disclaimed completeness for his collection of data. As a matter of fact, he overlooked one indubitable reference, a context in *Var. 32* (Frac. III, 390), which shows that Petrarch was familiar with the threnody on the sparrow. This omission was due to inadvertence, since the passage from Petrarch had been listed by Baehrens-Schulze, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig, 1893), 6, among the *testimonia* on the little poem. The passages in Petrarch's

works in which Catullus is merely mentioned and where no allusion to the *Libellus* or quotation from it occurs, Ellis made no attempt to register. This, of course, is only a minor deficiency. Nolhac, in his second edition, so far as my own examination of Petrarch's works shows, left no gaps in his collection of the references to Catullus or the quotations from him to be found in the humanist's writings. Nolhac has furthermore printed, presumably with accuracy and completeness, the citations from Catullus included in the marginalia of Petrarch's copy of Vergil, now preserved in the Ambrosian Library.

We must grant the likelihood that two citations inserted by Petrarch in his exemplar of Vergil, viz. Cat. 64, 171-172 and 327, were derived not directly from Catullus but from Macr. *Saturn.* vi, 1, 41-42. For, as Sabbadini, *Rendic. del r. ist. Lomb. di sc. e lett.* xxxix (1906), 381, has pointed out, in each of these two instances Petrarch wrote the name *Catulus*, the spelling found in the Codex Parisinus of Macrobius. Elsewhere in his citations of Catullus Petrarch seems to have spelled the name correctly. Sabbadini might also have remarked that Petrarch's reading of 64, 327, currite ducenti subtegmine currit te fusi, is closely akin to the variants found in Macrobius. Furthermore, there is at least the possibility that Petrarch's allusion to Cat. 1 in *Senil.* xi, 3, Solet enim, ut Catulli Veronensis verbo utar, meas aliquid putare nugas, was derived from Pliny's preface to the *Natural History*. However, even though we subtract these from the sum total of the evidence, we find that Petrarch evinces a definite acquaintance with 3, 35, 39, 49, and 64. Hence he was in a position at different times in his life to draw directly from the *Libellus*, and the conclusion that he possessed a manuscript of Catullus seems warranted.

Since the surface references in the Ambrosian *Vergil* and in the works of Petrarch suffice to prove his knowledge of the poems of Catullus, reminiscences and verbal echoes can be dispensed with as agencies of demonstration. The most that a collection of them can achieve is to teach us how strongly Catullus appealed to Petrarch, how readily the mod-

ern poet responded to the touch of that “tenderest of Roman poets,” and whether lines from Catullus sounded as constantly in the ears of Petrarch as did lines from Vergil, Horace, Ovid, and Statius. Such knowledge, however, the student of comparative literature and the lover of Petrarch will not rate as sheer Alexandrianism. It has its worth in so far as it contributes to that full appreciation of Petrarch’s classicism to which we have yet to attain, and reveals the predilections of his genius and his literary sympathies.

Now Ellis appended to his list of surface allusions a number of alleged parallels between the writings of Catullus and Petrarch (*op. cit.* 19). In four of these instances the Latin writings of Petrarch figure; in the others we find passages emanating from the Italian poems. These passages Ellis regarded as indubitably imitated from Catullus, moulded on him, or at least as pointing to inferences of such dependence. Ellis’s reviewers² accepted his results in the main. Most of the parallels Nolhac welcomed without reserve into the text and the footnotes of the second edition of his great work. Ellis’s conclusions thus have gained a standing in the annals of Petrarchan criticism, but the authority that has been accorded to them is not in all cases deserved. Some of his evidence, in the interests of sound scholarship in this field, must be ruled out of court, for the reason that he, his reviewers, and Nolhac failed to temper their estimates of the validity of the parallels by the rudimentary considerations that have already been mentioned. Resemblances, more or less close, between Petrarch and Catullus were regarded by Professor Ellis as constituting, without further ado, proof that Petrarch had had Catullus only in mind when the passage in question was written. No precautions were taken to discover whether search of the works of Cicero, Vergil, Ovid, or of some other Roman author with whom Petrarch was intimately acquainted, might not bring to light facts that would be disconcerting to inferences based on parallels between Petrarch and Catullus. Again, the manipulator of parallels, if he is to be deterred

² See Sabbadini, *Boll. fil. class.* xi (1904-1905), 227-228; K. P. Schulze, *Woch. kl. Phil.* xxii (1905), 511-512.

from extravagant assumption, must, of course, always bear in mind the fact that similar ideas tend to constrain like turns of expression in the case of two authors to whom Latin was a living tongue, even though they be far removed from each other in point of time. Ellis, nevertheless, was quick to assume that resemblances inhering in almost inevitable words and phrases were indicative of literary influence and relationship.

To be concrete : The sentence, *Nulla fugae, nulla spes igitur est salutis, de Rem. Utr. Fort.* I, 33, Ellis regarded as "palpably from Cat. 64, 186," where we read *nulla fugae ratio, nulla spes*, and he even queried whether Petrarch could have read *nulla spes*, because, we may presume, Petrarch actually inserts the rare verb *est*, whereas in our manuscripts of Catullus there is an ellipsis of the copula! If such a parallel constitutes proof, it would be easy to push theories of literary imitation to almost any limit. The outstanding word in Catullus is *ratio*. Perhaps, if we had met here in Petrarch the relatively rare combination of *spes* and *ratio*, which, by the way, occurs in Juv. *Sat.* 7, 1, there would be some justification for positing imitation and not coincidence, although I believe one could pardonably quarrel with a critic who should pronounce Juvenal's words a "palpable" echo of Catullus. As it is, there is nothing in Petrarch's sentence but the spontaneous expression of a common thought in obvious phraseology. Anaphora of *nullus* is an ingredient of style common to many authors, and is not an individual mannerism. Petrarch had seen the usage in a score of emphatic contexts in his model, Cicero; for examples, too numerous to quote, see Merguet. The words *spes, salus, fuga*, and *nullus* or an equivalent are, in the nature of things, bound to occur frequently in various combinations. The following examples have been collected only from the works of authors read by Petrarch. They are cited for illustration merely, for it is idle to see in any author the inspiration of concepts of such universality: Plaut. *Capt.* 518-519, *Hic illest dies quom nulla vitae meae salus sperabilest . . . neque adeo spes;* Caes. *B.G.* I, 25, 1, *ut . . . spem fugae tolleret;* *ib.* VII, 28, 2, *ne*

omnino spes fugae tolleretur; Verg. *Aen.* ix, 131 and x, 121, nec spes ulla fugae; Liv. xxx, 8, 8, nec in fuga salus ulla ostendebatur . . . neque spes veniae; Prop. ii, 30, 1, Quo fugis an demens? nulla est fuga; Ov. *Trist.* i, 2, 33, Scilicet occidimus nec spes est ulla salutis; *Fast.* iv, 538, Iam spes in puerō nulla salutis erat; Luc. *Phars.* ii, 113, spes una salutis; Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 1012, Quam fugam . . . petis? nullus salutis . . . est locus.

Ellis was equally certain that three other passages in the Latin works of Petrarch were "taken from a manuscript of the poems, but with no mention of Catullus' name." To one of these, *Famil.* v, 5 (Frac. i, 268), cum omnis repente clamor hominum superiore urbis parte siluisse, sed de litorea regione magis magisque crebresceret, the edition of Baehrens-Schulze had previously given the standing of a *testimonium* on Cat. 64, 273-274:

leviterque sonant plangore cachinni
Post vento crescente magis magis increbescunt.

Here again the point of contact does not reside in any exceptional or unique feature of thought or expression. Petrarch is writing about the hullabaloo of a multitude, panic-stricken under the stress of a violent tempest, Catullus about waves gathering force as the wind freshens. Such passages as Verg. *Aen.* XII, 406-407,

saevus campis magis ac magis horror
Cribrescit,

and *Geor.* i, 358-359,

Montibus audiri fragor, aut resonantia longe
Litora misceri et nemorum increbrescere murmur,

adequately illustrate the rashness of assuming that only the context in Catullus could have moved Petrarch to write as he did here. However thoroughly Petrarch may have known his Catullus, the *Libellus* can in no sense vie with the works of Vergil as a source of imitation and reminiscence for Petrarch. Certain it is that editors of Catullus cannot maintain over edi-

tors of the *Aeneid* a prior claim on this passage in Petrarch as a *testimonium*.

Still more difficult to justify is the assertion of Ellis that the combination of tenses of the verb *sum* in *Famil.* III, 3 (Frac. I, 144), *omnibus bellorum ducibus qui sunt quique erunt omnibus saeculis*, and *Epist. sine titulo*, 14 (*Opera*,³ 725), *omnibus qui sunt et qui fuerunt eruntve mortalibus*, are inevitably the results of the impact on Petrarch's fancy of three instances of the occurrence of present, past, and future in the poems of Catullus, viz. 21, 2-3; 24, 2-3; 49, 2-3. The more elaborate commentaries on Catullus, Ellis's as well as those of Baehrens-Schulze and Friedrich, present data in plenty which show that, as mother-wit would suggest, *genera loquendi* like our 'as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be,' or 'Thou who art and wert and ever more shall be,' are subject to no restrictions imposed by age, language, or literary form. Such utterances belong naturally to the language of praise and invective—in fine, to strong assertion in general, from Homer's *τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα* down. To the wealth of examples cited by the commentators from Greek and Latin prose and poetry, it is easy to add others, e.g. Cic. *Lael.* 22, 83, *quae si quos inter societas aut est aut fuit aut futura est*. Remembering that Petrarch had read Plaut. *Amph.* 553-554, *Quia id quod neque est neque fuit neque futurum est | mihi praedicas*; Cic. *Red. Quir.* 7, 16, Cn. Pompeius, *vir omnium qui sunt, fuerunt, erunt virtute . . . princeps*—to quote another of the various passages in which Cicero's *penchant* for the sequence of the three tenses or of two of them is revealed; Verg. *Geor.* IV, 392-393, *Novit namque omnia vates, | quae sint quae fuerint, quae mox ventura trahantur*; Ov. *Met.* I, 517, *quod eritque fuitque estque*; xv, 215, *nec quod fuimusve sumusve, cras erimus*; xv, 445, (*urbs*) *quanta nec est nec erit nec visa prioribus annis*; id. *Her.* 5, 157-158, *sed tua sum tecumque fui puerilibus annis, | et tua, quod superest temporis, esse precor*, we see that there is no basis in fact for making Catullus the sole literary model that could have prompted the usage. Ellis remarks in passing

³ The reference is to the second edition, issued at Basle in 1581.

that, unless his memory deceives him, the combination of tenses occurs also in the Italian poems, but quotes no instance from them. Perhaps he was thinking of *Son.* 85:⁴

Io amai sempre et amo forte ancora
E son per amar piú di giorno in giorno
Quel dolce loco, etc.

Bloodless criticism may, of course, see in this and in the parallel quoted by the editors from Boccaccio, *Decam.* II, 6, "Amai tua figlivola, et amo et amerò sempre," nothing but the result of the influence of Latin style, and shut its eyes to the possibility that the language of the lover in Humanistic times conceivably did not always require prompting from the phrase-book of antiquity.

In attempting to constate reminiscences of Catullus in the Italian poems of Petrarch, Ellis, I feel it my duty to say, followed the same uncritical methods. Where Petrarch sounds like Catullus, it must needs be the accents of Catullus in which he is speaking. It is regrettable for the permanence of Professor Ellis's work in this domain that he did not utilize a paper written by Anton Zingerle in 1871 and entitled, "Petrarca's Verhältniss zu den römischen Dichtern"; see Zingerle, *Kleine philologische Abhandlungen*, I, 5-21. The author restricted his discussion to the poems written to Laura in life; nevertheless, his results, so far as they go, are sound, and his conclusions, in the main, are still tenable. He well emphasizes the fact that, as a comparison of Petrarch and his Latin sources will show, the author of the *Sonnets* was so saturated with Latin poetry, had made its form and content so entirely part and parcel of himself, and was so free in his imitations, that we must not be beguiled into setting down as the vestige of a single Roman poet elements in imagery and diction that are common to the whole *corpus*, as it were.

Ellis was not thus chary. The famous lines that close *Son.* 65,

⁴ Throughout this paper the numbers of the *Rime* are as given by Carducci-Ferrari and Salvo Cozzo.

Non prego già, né puote aver piú loco,
 Che mesuratamente il mio cor arda ;
 Ma che sua parte abbi costei del foco,

Ellis viewed as moulded on Cat. 76, 23-24:

Non iam illud quaero contra ut me diligit illa
 Aut quod non potis est, esse pudica velit.

Schwabe, before Ellis, had seen such close resemblance here as to be moved to insert Petrarch's lines among the *testimonia* on Catullus; see Schwabe's *Catullus*, p. xv. Ellis, in the Oxford edition of the text (1905), singled out this supposed verbal imitation for especial mention (Praef. vi).

But surely the differences here are greater than the likenesses. The poem of Catullus is the outcry of despair uttered by a spirit entangled in the meshes of a hopeless passion. It is steeling itself, before the life-blood is quite sapped, to make the struggle to be free:

Una salus haec est, hoc est tibi pervincendum.

The Roman poet does not crave either reciprocated affection or loyalty. Petrarch, on the other hand, is beyond release, and asks, since his own flame cannot be quenched, that Laura take fire too. Ellis could scarcely have chosen a parallel more damaging to his contention; there is no lack of passages in Roman poetry of which the thought and the language of Petrarch form a far more faithful replica. For, as every reader of Roman poetry knows, 'I love you; may you also love me' is a *topos*—of elegy especially, but by no means limited to this branch of literature. Since the publication of Zingerle's treatise, the traditional parallel has been Tib. IV, 5, 5-8:

Uror ego ante alias : iuvat hoc, Cerinthe, quod uror,
 Si tibi de nobis mutuuus ignis adest.
 Mutuuus adsit amor, per te dulcissima furga
 Perque tuos oculos per Geniumque rogo.

Apropos of this instance of striking resemblance, Professor Kirby Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York,

1913), 501, makes this pertinent comment, which I heartily indorse: "In view of the large number of parallels, Petrarch, *Son.* 49, 'non prego già,' etc., cannot be called an echo of our passage." There are other passages in Tibullus and the *Corpus Tibullianum* which stand so much nearer in sense and expression to the lines of Petrarch than does the context in Catullus, that one is tempted to quote, for example, i, 2, 63–64:

Non ego totus abesset amor, sed mutuus esset
Orabam, nec te posse carere velim,

and with a change in the trope from flames to bonds, iv, 5, 13–15:

Nec tu sis iniusta, Venus: vel serviat aequa
Vinctus uterque tibi, vel mea vincla leva.
Sed potius valida teneamur uterque catena,

and iv, 6, 8:

Sed iuveni quaeso mutua vincla para.

Merely Ellis's determination to observe traces of the reading of Catullus in Petrarch prevented him from utilizing these parallels, we must suppose; for, as we shall have occasion later to note, Ellis assumed that Petrarch knew the elegies of Tibullus. This is a point as to which at present misgivings are in order. As yet no citation of Tibullus has been reported as existing in the Ambrosian *Vergil*, the marginalia of which form a safer index to Petrarch's knowledge of ancient authors than does the elusive parallel. Sabbadini inclines to the view that Petrarch had at least seen and read a manuscript of Tibullus.⁵ Nolhac, i, 173–176, argues that such knowledge as the humanist possessed of the work of his predecessor was derived from Ovid and from *excerpta*. This seems to be, in the light of our present evidence, the prudent attitude to assume toward this difficult question.⁶

But even if we leave Tibullus out of consideration, there

⁵ *Rend. del r. ist. Lomb. di sc. e lett.* XXXIX (1906), 385. Sabbadini had previously expressed a negative view; see *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci*, 23.

⁶ E. H. Wilkins, in a recent article in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXII (1917), 195, n. 3, holds to the traditional view that Petrarch had direct knowledge of Tibullus.

are Latin authors with whose works Petrarch was familiar, who present the motif in a form far better suited to have been a source of suggestion to him than is the context in Catullus. Only an obsession in favor of Catullus could neglect to take cognizance of the following passages: Ter. *Eun.* 91-94:

O Thais, Thais, utinam esset mihi
 Pars aequa amoris tecum ac pariter fieret,
 Ut aut hoc tibi doleret itidem ut mihi dolet
 Aut ego istuc abs te factum nili penderem !

Ov. *Amores*, I, 3, 1-2:

Iusta precor: quae me nuper praedata puellast,
 Aut amet aut faciat cur ego semper amem !

Id. *Met.* XIV, 23-24:

Nec medeare mihi sanesque haec vulnera, mando,
 Fineque nil opus est: partem ferat illa caloris.

How sure of his ground Ellis felt in dealing with this parallel is evinced by the fact that he did not hesitate to found on his conclusion an additional hypothesis. Taking this supposed case of imitation in connection with another context in Petrarch, which he asserted was "modeled" also on Cat. 76, he assumes that the two sonnets are "perhaps removed by a long interval" from each other in respect to time of composition, and hence suggests that this familiarity with Catullus, which is thus manifested at different epochs of Petrarch's life, is most plausibly explicable on the supposition that the humanist possessed a complete manuscript of the *Libellus*. As has been said before, the evidence adequately supports this view. Nevertheless, it is plain that if this view could be based on data no more convincing than those that Professor Ellis adduced in this one instance, it would be a structure founded on sand.

Let us now test the other instance of supposed indebtedness to 76 on Petrarch's part. The suggested parallel is *Son.* 334:

S' onesto amor po meritar mercede
 E se pietà ancor po quant' ella suole,
 Mercede avrò, etc.,

and Cat. 76, 1-6:

Siqua recordanti benefacta priora voluptas
Est homini, cum se cogitat esse pium,
Nec sanctam violasse fidem nec foedere in ullo
Divum ad fallendos numine abusum homines,
Multa parata manent in longa aetate, Catulle,
Ex hoc ingrato gaudia amore tibi.

Each poet is consoling himself with the thought of a future that shall accord with the deserts of the past. In so far the likeness holds. But the anticipated satisfaction is conditioned on very different causes. With Petrarch a righteous love and the normal workings of compassion in the breast of Laura are counted on to bring recompense. Catullus promises himself an old age in which some, though not perfect, happiness will abide in the consciousness that he has not proved recreant to the dictates of *religio* as specified in the *cum*-clause. The respective points of view are materially at variance. This is also true of the anticipated satisfaction. In the case of the Latin poet, the comfort, such as it is, which he is to obtain, will be resident in himself. Petrarch's recompense rests in experiences which are to come to him from without. His guerdons will be the compassion of Laura, who now can read his loyal soul, and a reunion with her in the after life. Thus, in respect to thought, the poets strike very different notes. There is no striking verbal likeness between the two; *pietà* is, of course, not *pietas*. Such resemblance as exists involves merely sequence of expression or sentence structure. The fact that each poem opens with a conditional sentence cannot be regarded as significant. This is a conventional type of *exordium*, examples of which it is easy to find in the works of other poets than Catullus; see, e.g., Hor. *Carm.* II, 8, III, 10, III, 23; *Epod.* 3; *Epist.* I, 5, I, 19; Ov. *Am.* II, 17, II, 19, III, 9; *Trist.* III, 10, III, 11; *Pont.* III, 3, IV, 15. Upwards of a dozen of the *Sonetti* and *Canzoni*, in addition to this poem of Petrarch, begin thus. In short, although to test the force of this parallel we cannot resort to the methods invoked in other instances, but have to be content with the generalities of lit-

erary analysis, I cannot bring myself to discern any indication that Petrarch was here influenced by Catullus.

According to Ellis, the beautiful sonnet beginning

Oh giorno, oh ora, o ultimo momento (329)

is "steeped in Catullus, particularly reflecting c. xxx, to Alfenus." Two parallels are quoted to validate the thesis that the influence of Catullus is here so pervasive. The lines

Ma 'nnanzi a gli occhi m' era post' un velo
Che mi fea non vedere quel ch' i' vedea

are compared with Cat. 64, 55,

Necdum etiam sese quae visit visere credit.

In this case Professor Ellis's memory suffered one of those lapses that prove that the great scholar is fallible, even in his own field. For science' sake the lesser critic must point them out, but as he does so, he cannot suppress an *absit omen*. Ellis forgot that the words *quae visit visere*, essential to his theory of imitation on the part of Petrarch, do not appear in our manuscripts, all of which are corrupt at this point, but are due to a conjecture of Isaac Voss, whose edition of Catullus was issued in 1684, three centuries after Petrarch's death. Schulze, in the review of Ellis's book to which reference has before been made,⁷ did not detect this blunder, and Nolhac accepted the parallel as assured. The manuscript in which Petrarch read his Catullus has not as yet been determined;⁸ hence we cannot tell to a letter what met his eye at this point or what sense, if any, he was able to derive from the context. However, since a disordered text is here universal to all the manuscripts, the passage was doubtless corrupt in the lost Codex Veronensis, the parent of our known texts, and the source from which, directly or through intermediation, Petrarch and those contemporaries, Pastrengo and others, who show an acquaintance with Catullus, derived their knowledge.

⁷ See p. 7, n. 2.

⁸ The suggestion made by Professor Hale in *Class. Rev.* xx (1906), 164, that O was Petrarch's manuscript, was later withdrawn, *Class. Phil.* III (1908), 244.

Petrarch, therefore, must have known this line in some one of the forms in which our variants exhibit it.

Thus there can be no talk of connection between Petrarch and Catullus in this case. But quite apart from Ellis's erroneous premise, Petrarch's oxymoron is one of those turns of language which it is rather futile to couple with any exclusive source. They are too universal to furnish a sure index to literary imitation. Expressions involving the difference between what is really seen and what is apparently seen, between clear sight and 'seeing through a glass darkly' are, so to speak, autogenetic in any imagination. No one has called attention to the striking resemblance in language between this passage in Petrarch and Plaut. *Mil.* 148-149:

Glaucumam ob oculos obiciemus, eumque ita
Faciemus ut, quod viderit, ne viderit,

and 405, 407:

Nunc demum experior mi ob oculos caliginem opstitisse.
· · · · ·

Nihil habeo certi quid loquar: non vidi eam, etsi vidi.

The *Miles* was not among the plays of Plautus known to Petrarch; however, lines 148-149 are quoted by Prisc. *Inst. gram.* vi, 7, where Petrarch had undoubtedly at some time read them. But so he had met Cic. *Phil.* XII, 2, 3, Quod videbam equidem sed quasi per caliginem: praestinxerit aciem animi D. Bruti salus, and some reading of Ov. *Her.* IO, 31:

Aut vidi aut tamquam quae me vidisse putarem.

The Bible, always a potent stylistic influence for the Christian world, abounds in locutions of the type under consideration. We may quote them as Petrarch read them: Isa. 29, 18, De tenebris et caligine oculi caecorum videbunt; Matt. 13, 13, quia videntes non vident; *id.* 13, 14, Videntes videbitis et non videbitis, etc. Not unrelated in thought are I Cor. 13, 12, Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate, and II Cor. 3, 14, sed obtusi sunt sensus eorum; usque in hodiernum enim diem id ipsum velamen in lectione veteris testamenti manet non

revelatum. These passages, to which others might be added, point the obvious moral that the line between coincidence and suggestion must not be drawn too dogmatically.

The second trace of Catullan influence on this sonnet Ellis saw in lines 5-8 :

Or conosco i miei danni, or mi resento,
Ch' i' credeva (ahi credenze vane e 'nfirme !)
Perder parte, non tutto, al dipartirme :
Quante speranze se ne porte il vento !

In these he discerned a reminiscence of Cat. 30, 9-10 :

Idem nunc retrahis te ac tua dicta omnia factaque,
Ventos irrita ferre ac nebulas aereas sinis.

But in the poets of the Empire, words, oaths, promises, and prayers that fail of effectiveness are forever the sport of the winds or the waves, or of the winds *and* the waves.⁹ Greek poetry had already developed the conceit into a proverb. None of the Roman poets whose works were known to Petrarch has a monopoly on expressions of this type, but Ovid exhibits an especial *penchant* for them. In *Am.* I, 6, 52,

Ei mihi ! quam longe spem tulit aura meam,

both in stylistic form and in language, we find a match to Petrarch's *Quante speranze*, etc., much closer than in the lines from Catullus cited by Ellis. In passing, we might suggest that one who was intent on finding in Catullus somewhere the model after which Petrarch wrote his line, could have cited a more apposite parallel in 64, 140-142,

mihi non haec miserae sperare iubebas,
Sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos,
Quae cuncta aerei discerpunt irrita venti,

where not *dicta factaque* but things that had been hoped for are wafted away into thin air. But to speak of a model in this connection, is to run the risk of circumscribing too nar-

⁹ For an abundance of examples see Zingerle, *Ovidius u. sein Verhältniss zu d. Vorgängern u. gleichzeitigen röm. Dichtern* (Innsbruck, 1869), I, 40-41, and Otto, *Sprichwörter*, 364-365.

rowly the sweep of Petrarch's imagination. It is true that Ovid furnishes the only convincing prototype of the *topos* in the form in which it is presented by Petrarch. Yet it is difficult to believe that Petrarch could not have written thus about the dispersion of hopes by the breezes unless he had been prompted by the line of Ovid. Variation of details within the limits of a rhetorical form, at the instigation of individual taste or fancy, is the prerogative of the inventive mind. Thus Horace extended the conventional limits of the figure when he wrote (*Carm.* i, 26, 1-3), *Tristitiam et metus tradam . . . portare ventis*. However, whether we are to see in Petrarch's line a conscious reminiscence of Ovid or his own variation of a characteristic locution of Roman poetry, it is evident that the data presented by Ellis cannot justify one in describing this sonnet as "steeped in Catullus."

Prone though Petrarch was to think the thoughts of the Romans after them, he was also a lover and a poet from whose heart and from whose lips welled the emotions and the utterances universal to poets and lovers. Hence, in the analytic study of the *Rime*, one is bound to be perplexed frequently in the effort to decide where classical suggestion ends and the unassisted light of nature begins. A case in point is furnished by the similarity between Petrarch, *Sestina* I, 31-33,

Con lei foss' io da che si parte il sole
E non ci vedess' altri che le stelle
Sol una notte,

and Cat. 7, 7-8:

Aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox,
Furtivos hominum vident amores.

Either of these passages is an apt parallel to the other. Ellis, of course, saw here another instance of conscious reminiscence on the part of Petrarch. I find a decision not so simple. The longing expressed by Petrarch for a single night with Laura beneath the stars, is a wish very natural to a lover, and the thought that only the stars would be witnesses of their loves is a spontaneous piece of poetic imagery. If it were not so

self-evident a product of the human imagination, we should be tempted to call it hackneyed in modern literature.¹⁰ Certainly we should not base upon its occurrence in two given authors inferences as to interdependence or imitation. Might not the figure have presented itself thus spontaneously to Petrarch? However this may be, in Roman poets other than Catullus there is no dearth of passages where Petrarch had found the thought expressed that the heavenly bodies look down on things terrestrial. In astrological parlance the guiding stars might be spoken of as beholding their charge; so Hor. *Carm.* II, 17, 17-19: *seu Libra seu me Scorpios adspicit . . . pars violentior natalis horae.* In the *conscia sidera* of Vergil and Statius, the idea of prescience is often uppermost; but in *Aen.* IX, 429, *conscia sidera testor*, Nisus seems to mean that the stars had viewed the foray of Euryalus and himself, hence were in a position to place the responsibility of the deed where it belonged. In Ov. *Trist.* IV, 3, the two Bears, who see everything (*omnia cum summo positae videatis in axe*), are asked to look down on Rome and discover whether the wife of the exiled poet is loyal to him (*Aspicite illa . . . moenia . . . | inque meam nitidos dominam convertite vultus*); cf. *Pont.* I, 5, 74, *Aspicit hirsutos comminus Ursa Getas*; Luc. *Phars.* I, 458, *populi quos despicit Arctos*. Other pertinent passages are: Prop. II, 9, 41, *Sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina*; Juv. 8, 149, *Nocte quidem sed Luna videt, sed sidera testes | intendunt oculos*; Ov. *Met.* xv, 840 f., *Hanc animam . . . | fac iubar, ut semper Capitolia nostra forumque | Divus ab excelsa prospectet Iulius aede*; *ib.* 850, *Stella micat: natique videns benefacta fatetur | esse suis maiora*; Stat. *Theb.* XI, 132-133, *ne virginis almae | sidera, Ledaei videant neutralia fratres* (*i.e.* the unnatural combat between Eteocles and Polynices); *Achil.* I, 643-644, *Admovet amplexus; vidit*

¹⁰ *E.g.* Keats, *Last Sonnet* "Bright star . . . watching, with eternal lids apart, the moving waters"; Coleridge, *Dejection*, "The stars hang bright above her dwelling, silent as though they watched the sleeping earth"; Bulwer-Lytton, *When Stars are in the Quiet Skies*, "Bend on me thy tender eyes as stars look on the sea"; Matthew Arnold, *Self-Dependence*, "(the stars) unaffrighted by the silence round them, undistracted by the sights they see."

chorus omnis ab alto | astrorum et tenerae rubuerunt cornua Lunae. Here, as in Catullus and Petrarch, it is a question of *furtivi amores*. These passages, which show that the concept was as self-evident to the Roman as it is to the modern poet, at least justify a very hesitant attitude toward Ellis's belief that Petrarch's lines are due to the influence of a single classical source.

Again, must we suppose that Petrarch could not have thought or written *Trionfo di amore*, 22, 185,

vite degli amanti
Com' poco dolce molto amare appaga,

that "the same idea" would not have "pervaded the *Rime* from first to last" unless he had been taught by the lines of Cat. 68, 17-18:

non est dea nescia nostri,
Quae dulcem curis miscet amaritem?

This oxymoron, variously phrased, belongs to the native language of lovers and poets from Sappho's γλυκύπικρον ὄρπετον on. Certainly a parallelism that rests on the expression of a theme so hackneyed is not a reliable index of literary relationship. *Amarus* and *dulcis* are not the inevitable Latin words in this connection; thus we have in Horace's famous phrase, *Carm.* iv, 1, 4-5, dulcium mater saeva cupidinum, and in Ov. *Amor.* ii, 9, 26, usque adeo dulce puella malumst. But the juxtaposition *amarus*—*dulcis* is especially favored, even in realms other than those of Amor; for examples see *Thes. Ling. Lat. s. v.* Neither the presence of the motif here or elsewhere in Petrarch, nor his *dolce*—*amaro* can stand as proofs of indebtedness to the passage in Catullus; for, even if one insists on believing that Petrarch's sentiment and the language in which it is expressed were echoes of his reading, there are other contexts, which were familiar to him, where the great paradox of love is set forth in phraseology similar to his own, e.g. Plaut. *Cist.* 69-70,

Namque ecastor Amor et melle et felle est fecundissimus;
Gustui dat dulce, amarum ad satietatem usque oggerit,

and Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 109–110, which Petrarch, of course, read thus:

quisquis amores
Aut metuet dulcis aut experietur amaros.

Ellis can scarcely have attached great significance to the comparison of *Son.* 83,

Se bianche non son prima ambe le tempie
Ch' a poco a poco par che 'l tempo mischi,
Securo non sarò, etc.,

and Cat. 61, 154–155:

Usque dum tremulum movens
Cana tempus anilitas.

Petrarch reproduces none of the vivid and individual touches of the description of palsied age given by Catullus. The thought that only white hairs can render him immune from love, is more in the vein of elegy. Thus Prop. III, 5, 23–25, where the poet, like Petrarch here, is counting on old age to put an end to love,

Atque ubi iam venerem gravis interceperit aetas
Sparserit et nigras alba senecta comas,
Tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores,

is at least as well adapted in respect to language and better in content to serve one, who, after the method of Ellis, is searching for a model in Roman poetry for the context in Petrarch. The only point of contact between Petrarch and Catullus lies in the reference to the temples as whitened by age, an obvious thought on which no stress can be laid. As we should expect, the words *canus*, *caneo*, and *tempora* are frequently found in juxtaposition in poetic descriptions of old age, e.g. Verg. *Aen.* v, 415–416:

Dum melior viris sanguis dabat aemula necdum
Temporibus geminis canebat sparsa senectus.

For other examples see Ov. *Met.* III, 275, III, 516, VIII, 568, XII, 465, XIV, 655, XV, 211; Stat. *Theb.* X, 706.

Different in character from the questions of parallelism which have been under discussion, but none the less involved

in the treatment of our subject, is a problem which presents itself in connection with one of Petrarch's surface references to Catullus. The citation occurs in *de Rem. Utr. Fort.* I, 59. Gaudium, one of the interlocutors, boasts: Armentorum gregumque ingens copia est. Ratio rejoins: Si per te ipsum illos paveris, quid nisi occupatissimus pastor eris? Officium vile, laudatum licet a multis; ante alias a Catullo Veronensi. Nolhac dismissed the citation with the comment: "Mais je n'ai pas retrouvé le texte de Catulle auquel Pétrarque veut faire allusion par les mots: *officium vile*," etc.; see *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, I, 165, n. 1. Under the circumstances, this remark of Nolhac's is unnecessarily hesitant. One would search Catullus in vain for any eulogy of the shepherd's life. Ellis's explanation is that Petrarch by a slip of memory confused Catullus with Tibullus. *Elegies*, I, I, I, 5, and II, 3 are suggested as contexts that would justify characterizing Tibullus as a praiser of the pastoral life.

This explanation of Ellis was not new, although the reader is not warned to the contrary. Ellis was simply repeating the opinion of Schwabe as stated in his *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, p. xv. This supposition, if its reliability could be substantiated, could be utilized as an affirmative argument in deciding the vexed question as to the extent of Petrarch's knowledge of the elegies of Tibullus. Indeed, Nolhac (*op. cit.* 173, n. 5), does consider the suggestion worthy of mention as evidence making for the view that Petrarch possessed some acquaintance, gleaned, to be sure, from the *Florilegia*, with the poems of Tibullus. Painful though it be to subtract any shred from our meager data on this subject, we must harden our hearts. The theory of Schwabe and Ellis is not valid. The content of the elegies does not support the view that Petrarch could have had Tibullus in mind but inadvertently have written *Catullus*. In none of the elegies specified by Ellis, nor elsewhere in the *Corpus Tibullianum*, is the shepherd's life presented in isolated and emphatic fashion as the ideal existence. It figures incidentally as one of the provinces of the happy farmer's activity, along with the labors of the plowman, the vine-dresser, and the dairyman. Hus-

bandy in general, life and love in the country (it is superfluous to remind the reader of Tibullus) form the burdens of his songs. No context contains eulogy of the business of the shepherd so specific and so fervent as to have made Tibullus, in case Petrarch had read his works wholly or in part, hold sway in the estimate of the humanist as the *laudator pastorum par excellence*. The work that Petrarch had in mind and that for the moment he carelessly ascribed to Catullus, must have been a source in which there was contained a sustained and explicit encomium on the pastoral life. Such a work is the *Culex*. Herein are found, notably in the passage beginning *O bona pastoris* (lines 58-97), a formal tribute, by no means lacking in literary beauty, to the charms of the life of the shepherd, and an exposition of the blessings and the simple pleasures that he enjoys. This passage and other lines from the poem which were pertinent in content and atmosphere were excerpted and combined into a selection for inclusion in the *Florilegia*. On the manuscripts in which the selection appears, see Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1908, Heft 11, 35; *Poet. Lat. Min².* 1, 4. The dates of these manuscripts extend from the twelfth to the fourteenth century; the codices are derived from a *Florilegium* made in France, apparently in the eleventh century. Thus before the age of Petrarch this excerpt had become established as the classic expression of its theme. That Petrarch deemed it the preëminent eulogy of the shepherd's life is evident from the fact that it appealed to him as the suitable analogue to Vergil's famous glorification of the lot of the peasant farmer (*Geor.* II, 458 f.). In the Ambrosian *Vergil*, apropos of this passage in the *Georgics*, Petrarch commented as follows: *Bona agricole. Adde bona pastoris, de quibus idem in Culice.* I quote the note as it is given by Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci*, 24, n. 5. Petrarch's acquaintance with the *Culex* is also attested by a passage in *Senil.* v, 2 (*Opera*, 794), where, in commenting on the famous question of the young Lucan, *et quantum restat mihi ad Culicem?* Petrarch wrote: *Huic insolenti per-
cunctioni, an tunc a quoque amicorum quidve responsum
fuerit, incertum habeo; certe ego ex quo illam legi primum, etc.*

Therefore there can be no doubt that the *Culex* or the selection from it was the piece that Petrarch inadvertently fathered on Catullus, and not one or more of the elegies of Tibullus. The blunder evidently was due only to a passing lapse of memory or attention, since Petrarch had no misgivings as to the Vergilian authorship of the *Culex*. The fact that he was capable of even momentary forgetfulness of the content of Catullus can scarcely bear on the question of the intimacy of his acquaintance with the *Libellus*. We know that, being human, he was not infallibly accurate in quotation, but that in the citation of authors whose works he knew thoroughly he fell into an occasional error. It is rather profitless speculation to discuss the cause that superinduced this particular slip. Evidently assonance in the names of the two authors had nothing to do with it, though Schwabe and Ellis assumed that this was the explanation of the error. Perhaps temporary confusion of the two *epyllia*, Cat. 64 and the *Culex*, lies at the root of the mistake. These works were, we must remember, literary novelties for Petrarch and his age.

This very frank critique of what was doubtless a *parergon* in the life of an esteemed and productive scholar has been undertaken in no censorious spirit. It merely seemed unfortunate that mistakes of omission and commission should continue to pass unnoticed in a study many of the results of which have been somewhat negligently accepted as sound. Of all the passages from Petrarch which were set forth by Ellis as supposedly influenced by Catullus, strict canons of criticism can accept, in my opinion, only one unreservedly.

Son. 212,

Solco onde e 'n rena fondo e scrivo in vento,

certainly incorporates an echo of Cat. 70, 4:

In vento et rapida scribere oportet aqua.

At least our existing collections of parallels testify that Catullus is unique among both Greek and Latin authors in the use of the figure 'writing on the *wind*.' Furthermore, Petrarch harks back to the line again in *contra Medicum* (*Opera*, 1093):

in vento et aqua scribite. The other parallels proposed by Ellis must be rejected uncompromisingly or their cogency must be gravely questioned. Our examination of them has revealed the perils of defective method and hasty conclusion and in so far may perhaps contribute in a small way some positive suggestion for future progress in a field which is far from being exhausted as yet. This fact in particular has emerged: In instances of resemblance between the *Rime* and a Latin poet, the precaution of looking beyond the apparent source should not be dispensed with, except when Petrarch guides us to a specific model by reproducing unmistakably individual and striking elements in diction, thought, or structure, as, for example, is true of *Son.* 145,

Pommi ove 'l sole occide i fiore e l' erba
O dove vince lui il ghiaccio e la neve, etc.,

which none but Horace could have taught him to write.